DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 802 TM 017 969

AUTHOR Marso, Ronald N.; Pigge, Fred L.
TITLE Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of the Extent and Effectiveness of Their Schools' Uses of Standardized Test Results.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (72nd, Orlando, FL, February 15-19, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Classroom Techniques; *Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Utilization; Mail Surveys; Rating Scales; School Districts; *Secondary School Teachers; *Standardized Tests; *Teacher Attitudes; Testing Problems; *Test Results; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio; Teaching to the Test

ABSTRACT

Approximately 225 classroom teachers representing 97 randomly selected Ohio school districts participated in this study. They were selected as being most able to accurately inform researchers of their districts' standardized testing practices. Responding to a mailed survey, these teachers rated their schools regarding the extent of use and the degree of effectiveness of uses for 17 testing practices. Major findings were that: (1) teachers varied little between their extent and effectiveness ratings; (2) elementary school teachers perceived more extensive and effective use of standardized test results than did secondary school teachers; (3) elementary school teachers perceived more diversity in the extensiveness and effectiveness of tests used for instructional purposes as compared to less instructionally related practices than did secondary school teachers; (4) teachers perceived more extensive and effective uses of standardized test results for non-instructional than they did for instructional purposes; and (5) few schools appeared to have established practices to facilitate the use of the results from standardized testing. There are three tables of study findings and a 16-item list of references. (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
RONALD N. MARSO
FRED L. PIGGE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED342802

Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of the Extent and Effectiveness of Their Schools' Uses of Standardized Test Results

Ronald N. Marso and Fred L. Pigge
Educational Foundations and Inquiry
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

A paper presented at the 72nd Annual Meeting
Association of Teacher Educators

Orlando, Florida
February 15-19, 1992

Running head: Uses Standardized Tests

TM017969

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Approximately 225 classroom teachers representing 97 randomly selected Ohio school districts who were selected as being most able to accurately inform the researchers of their districts' standardized testing practices participated in this study. These teachers rated their schools regarding the extent of use and the degree of effectiveness of the uses for 17 testing practices. It was found that the teachers varied little between their extent and effectiveness ratings, that elementary teachers perceived more extensive and effective use of standardized test results than did the secondary teachers, that elementary teachers perceived more diversity in the extensiveness and effectiveness of test uses for instructional as compared to less instructionally related practices than did the secondary teachers, that teachers perceived more extensive and effective uses of standardized test results for noninstructional than they did for instructional purposes, and that few schools appear to have established practices to facilitate the use of the results from standardized testing.

Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of the Extent and Effectiveness of Their Schools' Uses of Standardized Test Results

In the past decade both the general public and educational policymakers have successfully advocated the increased use of tests as a solution to perceived weaknesses in public education (Haney & Madaus, 1989). This increased use of tests, and standardized tests in particular, accentuates the need to examine to what extent and how effectively the results from these tests are being used and to examine the nature of the impact of this increased testing upon teachers, pupils, and the classroom instructional process (Paris, Lawton, Turner, & Roth, 1991).

Crooks (1988) stated that testing and evaluation in the public schools has received less research attention than most other aspects of education despite the increasing acceptance of testing as a potent force in the schooling process. Further, the findings from the limited research of standardized testing practices in the public schools raises several concerns about their use in schools. For example, Diamond and Fremer (1989) found that educational personnel have inadequate training in the interpretation and use of tests; Marso and Pigge (1990) reported that as many as one out of five directors of standardized

testing in public schools have no more formal testing and evaluation training than might be expected of beginning classroom teachers; and other researchers have reported that school standardized testing programs tend not to be administratively valued or well articulated within school districts (Gullickson & Hopkins, 1987; Sproull & Zubrow, 1981).

Many educators do not have a very positive attitude toward either standardized tests or their use in schools. Wood (1982) reported that educational administrators frequently do not distribute to or review with teachers the results from standardized tests; Green and Stager (1985) and Yeh (1981) found that teachers express an indifferent or neutral attitude toward standardized tests and view them as less useful than teacher-made tests; and Miller (1977) noted that school counselors frequently feel that standardized testing dominates too much of their time.

Even of more concern are the research findings more directly related to the use of results from standardized testing in the schools. Kinney, Brickell, and Lynn (1988) described the linkage between standardized tests and classroom instruction as at best weak and unclear. Linn (1990) and Salmon-Cox (1981) reported very limited uses of the results from standardized tests in classroom instruction, and Borg, Worthen, and Valcarce (1986) found unfavorable or indifferent classroom teacher

attitudes toward the use of standardized tests. Other researchers have suggested that standardized testing practices typically do not meet the feasibility criteria for successful integration within classroom instructional activities such as immediate accessibility of results, compatibility with daily instructional activities, and consistency with content being taught. Standardized tests are often scheduled at the end of the school year, and test results commonly are not available to teachers until six to eight weeks after the tests are administered (Dorr-Bremme, 1983; Hall, Carrol, & Comer, 1988).

Some research findings have indicated that those educators further removed from actual standardized test use tend to regard these tests and their use more positively than do those educators who have the opportunity to actually use the tests. Secondly, these research findings indicate that educators perceive that those in other positions in their schools rather than they themselves receive the primary benefits from standardized testing activities. For example, Wood (1982) reported that counselors and administrators rated standardized tests to be more useful for classroom instructional purposes than did teachers, and Sproull and Zubrow (1981) and Salmon-Cox (1981) found that school teachers and administrators both felt that the primary benefits of standardized testing accrued not to themselves but to the other.

Marso and Pigge (1991) investigated further the question of the various perceptions of who most benefits from standardized testing and concluded that educators do differ in their perceptions of the purpose of standardized testing programs. They found that these differences in perceptions of testing benefits varied by nature of job (teachers, supervisors, and principals) and grade level (elementary and secondary) assignments of their sample of educators. The elementary principals and teachers were found to perceive instructional purposes to be the most important purpose of standardized testing; whereas secondary teachers and principals perceived pupil counseling and guidance purposes to be the most important purpose of standardized testing at that level. Marso and Pigge suggested that these perceptions of testing purposes rather accurately reflected the actual focus of standardized testing at elementary and secondary levels of schooling, but they concluded that their findings neither strongly refuted nor clearly supported the generalization that educators more removed from actual test use perceive standardized testing more positively than those educators actually using the tests.

The purpose of the present study was to ascertain elementary and secondary classroom teachers' perceptions of the extent and effectiveness of their school districts' uses of the results from standardized testing. More specifically, this

study was conducted to investigate classroom teachers' perceptions of their school districts' uses of standardized test results within five categories of testing related activities. The basic question presented to the classroom teachers was to what extent and how effectively are the results from standardized testing in your schools used for: 1) classroom instructional decision-making (e.g., ability grouping, promotion-nonpromotion decisions, determining appropriate level of instruction, and planning day-to-day instruction), 2) curricular evaluation purposes (e.g., assessment of curricular weaknesses, identifying pupil skill areas needing attention, monitoring building instruction and curricula, and determining to what extent curricular and school goals are attained), 3) identifying pupils who need special attention (e.g., identifying exceptional children, revealing over- and under-achievers, placement of new pupils, and monitoring pupil performance over extended periods of time), 4) monitoring, judging, and guiding school district instructional quality (e.g., evaluation of teachers, planning district teacher inservice training, and for scheduling staff meetings to discuss implications of and use of test results), and 5) overall schools' decision-making activities?

Methods and Procedures

The data gathered for this paper were one component of a larger state-wide assessment of the management and operation of public school standardized group testing programs in Ohio. In the initial stage of sample selection all 616 nonvocational public school districts were contacted regarding their willingness to participate in an extensive investigation of standardized testing practices and of the uses of standardized testing results by classroom teachers, administrators, and testing directors. This inquiry resulted in 171 superintendents indicating a willingness to have their school districts participate in the study.

From the 171 school districts whose superintendents expressed a willingness to participate in the study, 106 districts were randomly selected using type of administrative organizations (city, county local, and exempted village) of the school districts as strata in the selection process. Of these 106 randomly selected districts, 97 districts (92%) ultimately did participate in the study.

The survey assessment instruments were mailed directly to the participating superintendents who in turn were asked to forward the sealed packets of materials to selected elementary and secondary school principals. The criterion provided to the superintendents for these selections was that the selected

principals should be those who would be most knowledgeable about and who could best inform the researchers about the practices and procedures of their school districts' standardized groups testing program.

The elementary and secondary school principals receiving the survey packets from their superintendents were directed to select and forward the enclosed survey materials to classroom teachers. The elementary principals were directed to select and to forward designated survey packets to one of the teachers in their school building assigned to grades one through four and to one of their teachers assigned to grades five or higher who could best inform the researchers about the practices and procedures associated with their school district's standardized group testing program. The secondary principals were given these same directions but were asked to select one of their teachers from the math-science and one from the English-social studies subject areas.

The preceding subject selection and contact procedures resulted in the return of usable survey assessment forms from 126 elementary and 92 secondary classroom teachers. These respondents were employed in schools organized by city district (42%), local county district (44%), and exempted village district (14%), in schools located in geographic settings described as rural (37%), suburban (57%), and urban (6%), and in

small schools (11% with fewer than 1,000 pupils), moderately sized schools (34% with 1,000 to 2,000 pupils), moderately large schools (34% with 2,001 to 4,000 pupils), and large schools (21% with more than 4,000 pupils).

The focus of the present report is upon the classroom teachers' responses to 17 survey items related to their school district's practices associated with and uses of the results from standardized testing. The teachers responded to each of the 17 testing practices or procedures items in two ways. The first was a rating of the "frequency of extent," and the second was a rating of the "relative effectiveness" of their school district's testing practices or procedures during the past year or two. This latter reference to time was provided to give the teachers a common reference point for their ratings.

A five-point scale with narrative descriptions at each scale point and with an accompanying "DK" response option defined as "I really do not know" was provided for the extent and the effectiveness response sets for the 17 testing practices or procedures. The frequency or extent scale ranged from very rarely or never '1' to always or nearly always '5', and the relative effectiveness scale ranged from we perform well below our average here '1' to we excel here '5'. In rating the relative effectiveness of their school districts' testing practices and uses, the classroom teachers were directed to rate

their school's effectiveness on each of the 17 items (16 practices and one overall rating) in terms of their perceptions of their school's performance on each practice compared to their school's overall performance as an educational institution. The 17 survey items, the scale response codes, and respondent directions are presented in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The ratings of the testing procedures or practice items were analyzed separately for the elementary and secondary teachers. For each level and total, the means of the teachers' ratings of the 16 practices were calculated and then these means were ranked in order of mean magnitude with the largest mean assigned a rank of '1' and the lowest mean a rank of '16.' The percent of teachers rating each of the 17 items was also noted to suggest how many of the teachers felt that they had sufficient knowledge about a particular practice or procedure to provide a rating (e.g., how many rated an item rather than selecting the "I really do not know" option).

Findings

As had been anticipated from previous research findings, the elementary and secondary teachers differed in their ratings of the standardized testing practices and procedures. The

ratings of the secondary teachers, when compared to the ratings of the elementary teachers, indicated that secondary teachers perceive standardized tests as being used to a lesser extent and as not being used as effectively in their schools. The secondary teachers' ratings suggest this in two ways. First, the secondary teachers' 17 extent and 17 effectiveness rating means related to their schools' testing practices and procedures are numerically lower (some to a sizeable extent) than the comparable rating means derived from the elementary teachers (see means presented in Tables 2 and 3). Second, the secondary teachers' ratings of the overall use of standardized test results in their schools (item number one) resulted in a mean of 2.95 for the extent scale and a mean of 2.92 for the effectiveness scale as shown in Table 2. Both of these two rating means fall below the mid-point value of '3' for the two rating scales (e.g., below average performance in this area of activity relative to the overall performance of their school district). Comparatively, the elementary teachers' ratings of the overall use of standardized test results in their schools resulted in means above average on both the extent and the effectiveness scales (means of 3.50 and 3.45, respectively as shown in Table 3).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The elementary and the secondary teachers, however, revealed considerable agreement in their ratings of the relative extent and of the effectiveness of their schools' testing practices and procedures. In other words, the elementary and secondary teachers tended to highly agree regarding which testing practices were used to a greater or lesser extent in their schools (Rho = .90) and in terms of which testing practices were more or less effectively used in their schools (Rho = .81). This can be seen by the similarity between the rank ordering of both the extent and effectiveness scale rating means for the elementary and the secondary teachers.

There was also high agreement between the teachers' extent and effectiveness ratings for each teaching level (Rho's of +.99 and +.97, respectively for the elementary and secondary teachers). These similarities between the extent and effectiveness ratings suggest that the teachers perceived the effective practices as being used more extensively and the ineffective practices being used less extensively.

The total group of elementary and secondary teachers rated both the extent and the effectiveness of the practices related to the use of standardized test results for making classroom

instructional decisions lower (items 2, 4, 5, and 11) than they rated the practices related to curricular purposes (items 7, 12, 13, and 15) and practices related to identifying pupils who need special attention (items 3, 8, 9 and 13), but higher than the practices related to monitoring and judging instructional quality (items 6, 10, 16, and 17). This suggests, as other researchers have previously noted, that teachers perceive the benefits of standardized testing not to accrue primarily to day to day instructional uses (e.g., Note that the teachers' ratings of item 11, use of test results for planning teachers' day to day instruction, was rank ordered 14 of 16 on both the extent and effectiveness scales for both the elementary and the secondary teachers.). The only rank order in the instructional uses category of testing practices which was above the mid-point rank of 8.5 was for item 2, use of test results for pupil ability grouping. The other items in this instructional category were rank ordered below the mid-point rank of 8.5 for both rating scales and for both the elementary and secondary teachers.

The testing practices rated among the highest on both the extent and the effectiveness scales by both the elementary and the secondary teachers were use of test results for "identifying exceptional pupils," "identifying over- and under-achievers," and "identifying pupil skill areas that need attention" (items

8, 9, and 12, respectively). The testing practices or procedures rated among the lowest on both the extent and the effectiveness scales by both the elementary and the secondary teachers were "evaluation of teachers/instruction," "aid in planning district teacher inservice training," and "planning teachers' day to day instruction," (items 6, 10, and 11, respectively).

In contrast to the many similarities noted between the rank ordering of the rating means of the elementary and secondary teachers, reasonably large differences between the ranks of the two groups of teachers can be noted on the effectiveness scale ratings for three testing practices. These discrepancies suggest that the elementary teachers perceived their schools' use of standardized tests to be relatively less effective than their schools' other testing practices for pupil ability grouping (item 2), for placement of new pupils (item 3), and for principals' use of test results to monitor building instruction and curricula (item 14) than did their secondary teacher cohorts.

Regarding teachers' use of the "DK" rating option, approximately 10% more of the teachers appeared to feel sufficiently knowledgeable to rate the instructional category of testing practices than the other three categories; and approximately 10% more of the teachers rated the testing

practices on the effectiveness scale as compared to the extent scale. Conversely, more of the teachers responded "I really do not know" to items 6, 10, 13, 14, and 15 which address testing practices more removed from classroom activities. These response patterns would suggest that the teachers used the "DK" option with discretion, for it might be expected that teachers would feel less aware of testing practices outside of classrooms and of the extent to which testing practices are used by other personnel.

The elementary teachers' ratings of items related to making classroom instructional decisions (items 2, 4, 5, and 11) and monitoring and judging instructional quality (items 6, 10, 16, and 17) indicate somewhat more diversity among the elementary teachers' ratings of testing practices within these two categories as compared to their ratings in the other two categories of testing practices. The average of the standard deviations on the extent and effectiveness scales for the instructional category are 1.30 and 1.22, respectively and for the monitoring instruction category are 1.31 and 1.29, respectively. The comparable average standard deviations in the other three categories are curricular evaluation 1.18 and 1.14, identifying pupils 1.21 and 1.14, and overall rating 1.07 and 1.03, respectively for the extent and effectiveness scales. This varying dispersion of the ratings suggests that

instructional uses of standardized test results, or perhaps more accurately the teachers' perceptions of these practices, vary more between teachers than do teachers' perceptions of the less instructionally related testing practices. The ratings of the secondary teachers within the various categories of testing practices did not reveal a greater diversity for the two instructional categories when compared to their ratings of the other categories of testing practices as was evident in the ratings completed by the elementary teachers.

Summary and Discussion

Approximately 225 classroom teachers representing 97 randomly selected school districts who were selected by their school building principals as being most able to accurately inform the researchers of their school districts' standardized group testing practices participated in the study. These teachers rated their schools relative to the extent of use and degree of effectiveness of 17 testing practices and procedures. The teachers' average ratings of the 17 standardized testing practices differed very little between the extent and effectiveness scales.

The elementary teachers when compared to the secondary teachers rather consistently rated higher the extent of use and the effectiveness of their schools' standardized testing practices. Further, the elementary teachers rated their

schools' overall standardized testing practices as being more effective than their schools' overall performance as an educational institution; whereas the secondary teachers rated the overall effectiveness of their schools' testing practices as being just at or just slightly below their school's overall performance as an educational institution.

The elementary teachers, but not the secondary teachers, revealed more diversity in their ratings of the extensiveness and the effectiveness of their schools' testing practices more closely associated with instructional activities than those testing practices less closely associated with instructional activities. The elementary and secondary teachers were, however, in high agreement in their ratings of both the relative extent of use and the relative effectiveness of their schools' testing practices. In other words, the elementary and secondary teachers agreed with each other regarding which of the testing practices their schools were rated as seldom or extensively used (Rho = .90) and for which their performance was rated as more or less effective (Rho = .81).

The classroom teachers reported less extensive use and a lower level of effectiveness of their schools' standardized testing practices which were more closely associated with instructional activities as compared with standardized testing practices less closely associated with instructional activities.

For example, the extensiveness and effectiveness of their schools' use of test results for planning day to day instruction was rated lower than for various practices related to curriculum purposes.

It appears from the elementary teachers' ratings that the use of standardized test results in making pupil promotion/nonpromotion decisions is relatively common in the elementary schools and is considered to be somewhat effective although a considerable range in diversity of responses were evident on this item (standard deviations of 1.36 and 1.28 for the extent and effectiveness scales, respectively). Regrettably, these findings do not reveal what cautions, if any, that their schools may have exercised in using the results from standardized testing in making decisions related to pupil promotion. In contrast, the teachers' ratings suggested that school use of standardized test results in evaluating teachers/instruction is relatively uncommon and is perceived by teachers to be a relatively ineffective practice. But certainly of concern, these findings suggest that most of the schools did not make concerted efforts (e.g., arranging school meetings to discuss implications of and use of test results) to promote the use of results from standardized testing.

The findings of this study rather clearly support the findings of other studies (Linn, 1990; Salmon-Cox, 1981)

suggesting that teachers use the results from standardized testing in very limited ways in day to day classroom instruction. These findings also provide clear support for those studies (e.g., Marso & Pigge, 1991) revealing differences between secondary and elementary teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of standardized tests.

Findings from the present study also offer support to those studies suggesting that schools do not have well organized practices and well articulated efforts designed to facilitate the use of the results from standardized testing (Gullickson & Hopkins, 1987; Marso & Pigge, 1990; Sproull & Zubrow, 1981). For example, the findings of the present study suggest that meetings are infrequently scheduled to discuss test results, that there are weak ties between testing and planning for teacher inservice, and that teachers have limited awareness of the uses of test results to monitor curriculum and pupil performance. And lastly, the findings of the present study provide further evidence that teachers perceive those educators more removed from day to day instruction as benefitting more than they themselves from standardized testing (Salmon-Cox, 1981; Sproull & Zubrow, 1981), for the teachers rated their schools' uses of those testing practices less closely tied to instructional activities as being more extensive and more

effective than they rated those practices more closely tied to instruction.

PC:6

References

Borg, W. R., Worthen, B. R., & Valcarce, R. W. (1986). Teachers' perceptions of the importance of educational measurement. Journal of Experimental Education, 55(1), 9-14.

Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on student. Review of Educational Research, 58, 438-481.

Diamond, E. E., & Fremer, J. (1989). The joint committee on testing practices and the code of fair testing practices in education. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 8, 23-27.

Dorr-Bremme, D. W. (1983). Assessing students: Teachers' routine practices and reasoning. Evaluation Comment, 6, 1-12.

Green, K. E., & Stager, S. F. (1985). Teachers' attitudes toward testing. A paper presented to the National Council on Measurement in Education, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 253 588).

Gullickson, A. R., & Hopkins, K. D. (1987). The context of educational measurement instruction for preservice teachers: Professor perspectives. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices, 6, 12-16.

Hall, B. W., Carroll, D., & Comer, C. B. (1988). Test use among classroom teachers and its relationship to teaching level and teaching practices. Applied Measurement in Education, 2, 145-156.

Kinney, D., Brickell, J., & Lynn, M. A. (1988). Testing programs in Illinois elementary school districts: The relationships between standardized achievement, competency-based, and teacher-made tests. Paper presented at the American Research Association annual meeting, New Orleans.

Linn, R. L. (1990). Essentials of student assessment: From accountability to instructional aid. Teachers College Record, 91(3), 422-436.

Marso, R. N., & Pigge, F. L. (1991). Testing directors, principals, supervisors, and teachers perceptions of the actual purposes of school standardized testing programs. A paper presented at the National Council for Measurement in Education. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. TM 016571).

Marso, R. N., & Pigge, F. L. (1990). Training, job titles, and responsibilities of directors of public school standardized testing programs. A paper presented at the National Council for Measurement in Education. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. TM 15189).

Miller, G. M. (1977). After the testing is over. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, December, 139-143.

Paris, S. G., Lawton, T. A., Turner, J. C., & Roth, J. L. (1991). A developmental perspective on standardized achievement testing. Educational Researchers, 20(5), 12-20.

Salmon-Cox, L. (1981). Teachers and standardized achievement tests: What's really happening? Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 628-631.

Yeh, J. P. (1981). Teachers and testing: A survey of test use. Center for the Study of Evaluation, California University, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 218 336).

Wood, C. M. (1982). The role of standardized achievement tests in the management of instruction: A survey of teacher and administrator practices and attitudes. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 219 446).

PC:6

Table 1

School Testing Practices and Procedures Rating Form

Please rate each of the following group testing practices or procedures during the immediate past year or two (e.g., 1986-87 and 1987-88) in your school(s) or district(s). Please respond to each item the best you can although you may be more or less informed about some of these practices. You should have two circled responses for each practice or procedure, one response for "frequency of extent" and one response for "relative effectiveness." (Exclude from your ratings testing you may be doing this year or in the future due to Ohio's mandated competency and related testing activities.)

Response Codes

	Frequency of Extent		Relative Effectiveness*
'1'	Very rarely or never	'1'	We perform well below our average* here
'2'	About 1/4 of the time	'2'	We perform below our average here
'3'	About 1/2 of the time	'3'	About average performance for us
'4'	About 3/4 of the time	'4'	We perform somewhat above average here
'5'	Always or nearly always	'5'	We excel here
'DK'	I really do not know	'DK'	I really do not know

*Your perception of your school's performance on this practice relative to its overall performance as an educational institution.

	Practice or Procedure	Extent						Effectiveness					
		low				high	(?)	low				high	(?)
1.	Effective use of test results in schools (overall)	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
2.	Use of test results for pupil ability grouping	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
3.	Use of test results for placement of new pupils	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
4.	Use of test results for assistance in making pupil promotion/nonpromotion decisions	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
5.	Use of test results for planning the level of instruction for individual classes	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
6.	Use of test results for evaluation of teachers/instruction	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
7.	Use of test results for assessment of curricular weaknesses	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
8.	Use of test results for identifying exceptional pupils	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
9.	Use of test results for identifying over- and under-achievers	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
10.	Use of test results to aid in planning district teacher inservice training	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
11.	Use of test results for planning teachers' day-to-day instruction	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
12.	Use of test results for identifying pupil skill areas that need attention	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
13.	Use of test results for principal/supervisor monitoring of quality of pupil performance over extended time periods	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
14.	Building principals use test results to monitor building instruction and curricula	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
15.	Standardized test scores are used to identify to what extent curricular and school goals are attained	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
16.	Specific guidelines or criteria exist to "screen" out students with difficulties	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK
17.	School meetings are arranged to discuss implications of and use of test results	1	2	3	4	5	DK	1	2	3	4	5	DK

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Secondary Teachers' Extent of Use and Relative Effectiveness Rating Means and Mean Ranks for Their School's Testing Practices and Procedures

		Frequency of Extent				Relative Effectiveness			
		%*	SD	M	Rank	%*	SD	M	Rank
Classroom instructional decisions									
2.	Use of test results for pupil ability grouping	87	1.16	2.78	6	79	1.02	2.96	3
4.	Use of test results for assistance in making pupil promotion/nonpromotion decisions	68	1.20	2.29	10	64	1.23	2.63	9
5.	Use of test results for planning the level of instruction for individual classes	89	1.23	2.20	12.5	83	1.10	2.34	13
11.	Use of test results for planning teachers' day-to-day instruction	91	1.15	1.82	14	87	1.04	2.11	14
		84	1.19	2.27	–	78	1.10	2.51	–
Curriculum evaluation purposes									
7.	Use of test results for assessment of curricular weaknesses	79	1.28	2.66	7	74	1.13	2.78	7
12.	Use of test results for identifying pupil skill areas that need attention	97	1.19	2.91	3	92	.97	2.93	4
14.	Building principals use test results to monitor building instruction and curricula	55	1.22	2.20	12.5	52	1.11	2.42	12
15.	Standardized test scores are used to identify to what extent curricular and school goals are attained	72	1.23	2.86	4	68	1.13	2.86	5.5
		76	1.23	2.66	–	72	1.09	2.75	–
Identifying pupils who need special attention									
3.	Use of test results for placement of new pupils	65	1.25	2.43	9	61	1.18	2.64	8
8.	Use of test results for identifying exceptional pupils	87	1.16	3.79	1	82	1.09	3.67	1
9.	Use of test results for identifying over- and under-achievers	86	1.22	3.37	2	83	1.07	3.21	2
13.	Use of test results for principal/supervisor monitoring of quality of pupil performance over extended time periods	62	1.25	2.44	8	62	1.14	2.49	10
		75	1.22	3.01	–	72	1.12	3.00	–

(table continues)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		%*	SD	M	Rank	%*	SD	M	Rank
Monitoring and judging district instructional quality									
6.	Use of test results for evaluation of teachers/instruction	66	.89	1.46	16	58	1.16	2.09	15
10.	Use of test results to aid in planning district teacher inservice training	72	1.02	1.70	15	66	1.05	1.97	16
16.	Specific guidelines or criteria exist to "screen" out students with difficulties	66	1.29	2.80	5	64	1.17	2.86	5.5
17.	School meetings are arranged to discuss implications of and use of test results	98	1.29	2.28	11	90	1.15	2.47	11
		76	1.12	2.06	--	70	1.13	2.35	--
Overall or combined purposes in district									
1.	Effective use of test results in schools (overall)	92	1.07	2.95	--	91	1.03	2.92	--

*The percentage of the 92 secondary teachers responding to this item when given the response option of "DK - I do not know."

Table 3

Elementary Teachers' Extent of Use and Relative Effectiveness Rating Means and Mean Ranks for Their School's Testing Practices and Procedures

		Frequency of Extent				Relative Effectiveness			
		%*	SD	M	Rank	%*	SD	M	Rank
Classroom instructional decisions									
2.	Use of test results for pupil ability grouping	90	1.39	3.07	9	88	1.21	3.13	9
4.	Use of test results for assistance in making pupil promotion/nonpromotion decisions	87	1.36	2.85	12	84	1.28	3.04	10
5.	Use of test results for planning the level of instruction for individual classes	89	1.24	2.93	11	88	1.18	2.98	12
11.	Use of test results for planning teachers' day-to-day instruction	89	1.19	2.60	14	83	1.19	2.83	14
		89	1.30	2.86	--	86	1.22	3.00	--
Curriculum evaluation purposes									
7.	Use of test results for assessment of curricular weaknesses	81	1.23	3.61	4	82	1.21	3.48	4
12.	Use of test results for identifying pupil skill areas that need attention	90	1.04	3.79	3	90	1.05	3.67	2.5
14.	Building principals use test results to monitor building instruction and curricula	57	1.28	3.28	8	55	1.19	3.28	7
15.	Standardized test scores are used to identify to what extent curricular and school goals are attained	68	1.17	3.51	5	65	1.10	3.35	5.5
		75	1.18	3.55	--	74	1.14	3.45	--
Identifying pupils who need special attention									
3.	Use of test results for placement of new pupils	87	1.43	2.80	13	83	1.29	2.84	13
8.	Use of test results for identifying exceptional pupils	90	1.03	4.28	1	89	1.07	4.10	1
9.	Use of test results for identifying over- and under-achievers	90	1.15	3.81	2	90	1.06	3.67	2.5
13.	Use of test results for principal/supervisor monitoring of quality of pupil performance over extended time periods	60	1.22	3.44	6	59	1.14	3.35	5.5
		82	1.21	3.58	--	80	1.14	3.49	--

(table continues)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		%	SD	M	Rank	%	SD	M	Rank
Monitoring and judging district instructional quality									
6.	Use of test results for evaluation of teachers/instruction	66	1.20	1.94	16	56	1.26	2.26	16
10.	Use of test results to aid in planning district teacher inservice training	63	1.32	2.34	15	61	1.30	2.44	15
16.	Specific guidelines or criteria exist to "screen" out students with difficulties	76	1.28	3.29	7	76	1.26	3.15	8
17.	School meetings are arranged to discuss implications of and use of test results	90	1.45	2.97	10	86	1.32	3.02	11
		74	1.31	2.64	--	70	1.29	2.72	--
Overall or combined purposes in district									
1.	Effective use of test results in schools (overall)	89	1.07	3.50	--	87	1.01	3.45	--

*The percentage of the 126 elementary teachers respondingto this item when given the response option of "DK - I do not know."